## Case4:11-cv-00698-CW Document20 Filed09/12/11 Page1 of 5

1 2 3 4 5	MICHELLE A. CHILDERS (SBN #197064) michelle.childers@dbr.com NATHAN D. CARDOZO (SBN #259097) nathan.cardozo@dbr.com DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105-2235 Telephone: (415) 591-7500 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510				
6 7 8	Attorneys for Defendants ETHICON, INC. (on its own behalf and behalf of its Division, ETHICON WOMEN'S HEALTH & UROLOGY, and erroneously sued as GYNECARE, INC.); and JOHNSON & JOHNSON				
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
10					
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	OAKLAND DIVISION				
13					
14	GINA LAFORGE, an individual,	Case No. 4:11-CV	7-00698-CW		
15	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER RE DIS	ATION AND [ <del>PROPOSED]</del> MISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S TITHOUT PREJUDICE		
16	GYNECARE, INC., a California	Judge:	Hon. Claudia Wilken		
17	corporation; ETHICON, INC., a New Jersey corporation; JOHNSON &	Complaint Filed:	October 20, 2010		
18 19	JOHNSON, a New Jersey corporation; and DOE MANUFACTURES ONE through ONE HUNDRED,	Trial Date:	Not set		
20	Defendants.				
21					
22	WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiff Gina LaForge has requested that counsel for Defendants				
23	Ethicon, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson enter into negotiations regarding the response of Defendant				
24	to an anticipated motion of Plaintiff to dismis	ss the above-captioned	litigation pursuant to Federal		
25	Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) without pre	judice for the purpose	of re-filing the above-		
26	captioned action in the state courts of New Je	ersey; and			
27	WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiff also represents eleven (11) other Plaintiffs who have 11				
28	similar lawsuits that are pending against Defe	endants Ethicon, Inc. a	and Johnson & Johnson in		
E &	JOINT STIPULATION & [PROPOSED] ORDER RE DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT SF01/782412.1		CASE No. 4:11-CV-00698-CW		

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	
2	7	
2	8	

Federal or State court of six different States, viz., the States of California, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, New Mexico, and Washington, with 10 of those suits pending in federal district court; and

WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiff has indicated that said counsel would file similar motions to dismiss without prejudice in ten (10) pending federal district court actions all for the purpose of re-filing each one of those actions in the state courts of New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiff has requested that counsel for Defendants consider a global resolution of how the Plaintiffs and Defendants may reach a mutual stipulation and agreement regarding the dismissal without prejudice of all eleven (11) lawsuits, thereby facilitating the dismissal of those actions and conserving the resources of the Federal judicial system; and

WHEREAS, the "primary purpose of Rule 41(a)(2) is to protect the interests of the defendant, although the court should weigh the equities and do justice to all the parties in the case" and therefore, a "dismissal without prejudice should be denied when the defendant will suffer 'plain legal prejudice' but should normally be granted in the absence of such prejudice," see 8 Moore's Federal Practice ¶ 41.40[5][a], at p. 41-141 (3d ed. 2010); and

WHEREAS, counsel for Defendants have indicated the willingness of Defendants to enter into negotiations that would result in the dismissal without prejudice of the foregoing eleven (11) lawsuits so long as the relative legal positions that exist between the parties in each of the eleven (11) lawsuits will not be prejudiced either now upon dismissal or when counsel for the eleven (11) Plaintiffs re-file their current lawsuits in any subsequent judicial forum; and

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have agreed that the legal status quo that now exists between the parties in their separate pending lawsuits should be preserved and maintained in any future proceeding that is re-filed by any Plaintiff against Defendants; and

Plaintiff Gina LaForge and Defendants Ethicon, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson therefore mutually STIPULATE and AGREE to the conditional dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice, and in accordance with the terms of their MUTUAL AGREEMENT and STIPULATION, the Court, pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 41(a)(2), hereby finds and

JOINT STIPULATION & [PROPOSED] ORDER RE

DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

SF01/782412.1

## ORDERS as follows:

- 1. The Complaint of Plaintiff is hereby conditionally dismissed without prejudice subject to (a) Plaintiff agreeing and stipulating that the conditions set forth in this paragraph and paragraphs 2-12 below shall be imposed in any and all lawsuits that Plaintiff subsequently files against Defendants or either of them ("Defendants") in any state or federal court located in any state, territory, or possession of the United States of America or in any court in the District of Columbia related to the subject matter of Plaintiff's Complaint filed in the case sub judice ("Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit") and (b) that the parties' compliance with the terms of the settlement contract shall be one of the material terms of their contract and this order.
- 2. The time of filing Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit shall be deemed to be the time of filing Plaintiff's original action against Defendants for purposes of calculating the limitations period that applies to Plaintiff's claims, rather than the actual date when Plaintiffs file their subsequent litigation in New Jersey. Any statute of limitations, prescription, or repose that applies to Plaintiff's Complaint filed in the case sub judice, if shorter in duration than any other statute of limitations, prescription, or repose that may apply in Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit, shall apply in Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit in lieu of any other statute of limitations, prescription, or repose.
- 3. Any state statute that places a cap, ratio, or other limitation upon the amount of non-economic damages or the amount of punitive damages that may be recovered by Plaintiff and applies to Plaintiff's Complaint filed in the case sub judice, if lower than the amount of the caps, ratios, or other limitations contained in any such state statute, if any, that may apply in Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit, shall apply in Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit in lieu of any other such state statute.
- 4. Plaintiff(s) shall not file Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit without first producing to counsel for Defendants copies of medical records and hospital records of Plaintiff which allegedly show that Plaintiff was allegedly implanted with one or more medical devices manufactured by Defendant Ethicon, Inc., including the physician's notes of each one of Plaintiff's implanting surgeons and treaters whom Plaintiffs consulted about the conditions leading to Plaintiff's

JOINT STIPULATION & [PROPOSED] ORDER RE

DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

SF01/782412.1

surgery(ies).

- California which severed the parties to the original action in which Plaintiff was a party and transferred the Plaintiff's claims to this District Court ("Order to sever and transfer"), Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Sever Under Rule 21 and Transfer Under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) or, in the Alternative, 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), (Apr. 6, 2011), was an appealable order to the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. *See Coughlin v. Rogers*, 130 F.3d 1348, 1349 (9th Cir. 1997). Because the time within which Plaintiff may take an appeal from the Order to sever and transfer has run, *see* Fed. R. App. Pro. 4(a)(1)(A), the Order to sever and transfer is now final and is res judicata between Plaintiff and Defendants as to those issues decided by said Order to sever and transfer. Accordingly, the final Order to sever and transfer will not be treated as a nullity and will not be vacated by this District Court as a result of its conditional dismissal of this action, *see National R.R. Passenger Corp. v. International Ass'n of Machinists & Aerospace Workers*, 915 F.2d 43, 48 (1st Cir. 1990), and the Order to sever and transfer is entitled to be given *stare decisis* effect in any forum.
- 6. Upon being served with a summons and complaint and when answering or otherwise responding in the manner required by law in Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit, Defendant may also assert and allege any other defenses that are available under the laws of the forum State in which Plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit is filed.
- 7. The parties agree that it would be difficult to calculate actual damages, beyond recovery of costs and attorneys' fees, arising from a material breach of this Agreement. As such, the parties agree that in the event either party breaches this Agreement, which governs the disposition and dismissal of eleven (11) lawsuits, the breaching party shall be subject to one, but only one, legal action for said breach and shall pay to the non-breaching party the sum of \$15,000 as liquidated damages. The parties agree that this amount constitutes a reasonable estimate of damages and that this amount does not constitute and should not be construed as a penalty.

RINKER BIDDLE &

REATH LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SAN FRANCISCO

## Case4:11-cv-00698-CW Document20 Filed09/12/11 Page5 of 5

1	The failure of Plaintiff or her counsel to adhere to any of the preceding conditions is a		
2	material breach of her MUTUAL AGREEMENT AND STIPULATION with Defendants.		
3	Dated: September 9, 2011 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP		
4			
5	By: /s/ Michelle A. Childers		
6	Michelle A. Childers		
7	Attorneys for Defendants ETHICON, INC. (on its own behalf and behalf of its Division, ETHICON WOMEN'S		
8	HEALTH & UROLOGY, and erroneously sued as GYNECARE, INC.); and JOHNSON		
9	& JOHNSON		
10			
12	Dated: September 9, 2011 GIRARDI   KEESE		
13	By: /s/ Amanda Kent		
14	Amanda Kent		
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
16	GINA LaFORGE		
17	ORDER		
18	ORDER		
19	PURSUANT TO THE FOREGOING MUTUAL AGREEMENT AND		
20	STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED, this the of September_, 2011.		
21	BY THE COURT		
22			
23	By: No charle Claudia Wilken		
24	United States District Judge		
25			
26 27			
28			
LE &	JOINT STIPULATION & [ <del>Proposed]</del> Order Re		

DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO